



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,143	03/21/2001	Jianguo Sun	00-02	2483

30031 7590 06/18/2003

MICHAEL W. HAAS, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL  
RESPIRONICS, INC.  
1010 MURRY RIDGE LANE  
MURRYSVILLE, PA 15668

EXAMINER

HARLE, JENNIFER I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,143

Applicant(s)

SUN ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer I. Harle

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3627

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-58 are pending. Claims 1-58 are subject to an election/restriction requirement.

Claims 1-19 were elected by Applicant via telephone, see below.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a multichannel communication system and method for healthcare management, classified in class 705, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 20-29 and 36-55, drawn to providing electronic shopping to persons completing surveys, classified in class 705, subclass 26.
- III. Claims 30-35, drawn to collecting and processing information about a patients condition, classified in class 705, subclass 3.
- IV. Claims 56-58, drawn to selling advertising with a nominal recitation of healthcare, classified in class 705, subclass 14.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II-V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions. The function of invention I is an information management system and method which receives and manages information associated with a patient and transmits that information to three distinct parties. Invention II functions to provide electronic shopping to persons completing surveys. Invention III functions to collect and process

Art Unit: 3627

information about a patient. Invention IV functions to sell advertising. All these functions are different and unrelated.

Inventions III and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require any shopping. The subcombination has separate utility such as permitting the patient to shop and buy items.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search requires for each of the groups is not required for the other, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Haas on April 1, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-19. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20-58 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 3627

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The IDS listed on the file jacket is missing, neither the paper nor the references are in the file. Applicant is requested to submit a new copy.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Although Applicant(s) use “means for” in the claim(s) (e.g. claim 1), it is the Examiner’s position that the “means for” phrase(s) do not invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph. If Applicant(s) concur, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicant(s) to either amend the claim(s) to remove all instances of “means for” from the claim(s), or to explicitly state on the record why 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph should not be invoked.

Alternatively, if Applicant(s) desire to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicant(s) to expressly state their desire on the record. Upon receiving such express invocation of 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, the “means for” phrase(s) will be interpreted as set forth in the *Supplemental Examination Guidelines for Determining the Applicability of 35 USC 112 6th Paragraph*.<sup>1</sup>

Failure by Applicant(s) to address the 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph issues in the manner set forth above or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered a desire by Applicant(s) NOT to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph.

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Register Vol. 65, No 120, June 21, 2000.

### ***Lexicography***

After careful review of the specification and prosecution history, the Examiner is unaware of any desire—either expressly or implicitly—by Applicant(s) to be their own lexicographer and to define a claim term to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning. Therefore, the Examiner starts with the presumption that all claim limitations are given their ordinary and accustom meaning. See *Bell Atlantic Network Services Inc. v. Covad Communications Group Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1268, 59 USPQ2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2001)(“[T]here is a heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.”); *CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366, 62 USPQ2d 1658, 1662 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (There is a “heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning.”). See also MPEP §2111.01 and *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).<sup>2</sup>

In accordance with the ordinary and accustom meaning presumption, during examination the claims are interpreted with their “broadest reasonable interpretation . . . .” *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997).<sup>3</sup>

However, if Applicant(s) wish to use lexicography and desire a claim limitation to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustom meaning, the Examiner respectfully requests

---

<sup>2</sup> It is the Examiner’s position that “plain meaning” and “ordinary and accustom meaning” are synonymous. See e.g. *Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 274 F.3d 1336, 1342, 60 USPQ2d 1851, 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[A]ll terms in a patent claim are to be given their plain, ordinary and accustomed meaning . . .”).

<sup>3</sup> See also MPEP §2111; *In re Graves*, 69 F.3d 1147, 1152, 36 USPQ2d 1697, 1701 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852, 858, 225 USPQ 1, 5 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (en banc).

Art Unit: 3627

Applicant(s) in their next response to expressly indicate<sup>4</sup> the claim limitation at issue<sup>5</sup> and to show where in the specification or prosecution history the limitation is defined. Such definitions must be clearly stated in the specification or file history. *Bell Atlantic*, 262 F.3d at 1268, 59 USPQ2d at 1870, (“[I]n redefining the meaning of particular claim terms away from the ordinary meaning, the intrinsic evidence must ‘clearly set forth’ or ‘clearly redefine’ a claim term so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the patentee intended to so redefine the claim term”).<sup>6</sup> The Examiner cautions that no new matter is allowed.

Failure by Applicant(s) in their next response to address this issue or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered a desire by Applicant(s) to forgo lexicography in this application and to continue having the claims interpreted with their ordinary and accustom meaning and with their broadest reasonable interpretation. Additionally, it is the Examiner’s position that above requirements are reasonable.<sup>7</sup> Applicant(s) are also

---

<sup>4</sup> “Absent an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning, terms in a claim are to be given their ordinary and accustomed meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Wenger Manufacturing Inc. v. Coating Mach. Sys., Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1225, 1232, 57 USPQ2d 1679, 1684 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citations and quotations omitted). “In the absence of an *express intent* to impart a novel meaning to claim terms, an inventor’s claim terms take on their ordinary meaning. We indulge a heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning. [Emphasis added.]” *Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325, 63 USPQ2d 1374, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and quotations omitted).

<sup>5</sup> “In order to overcome this heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language, it is clear that a party wishing to use statements in the written description to confine or otherwise affect a patent’s scope must, at the very least, point to a term or terms in the claim with which to draw in those statements.” *Johnson Worldwide Assocs. v. Zebco Corp.*, 175 F.3d 985, 989, 50 USPQ2d 1607, 1610 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

<sup>6</sup> See also *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582, 39 USPQ2d 1573, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996), (“[A] patentee may choose to be his own lexicographer and use terms in a manner other than their ordinary meaning, as long as the special definition of the term is *clearly stated* in the patent specification or file history. [Emphasis added.]”); *Multiform Desiccants Inc. v. Medzam Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1477, 45 USPQ2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“Such special meaning, however, must be sufficiently clear in the specification that any departure from common usage would be so understood by a person of experience in the field of the invention.”). See also MPEP §2111.02, subsection titled “Applicant May Be Own Lexicographer” and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled “New Terminology.”

<sup>7</sup> The requirements are reasonable on at least two separate and independent grounds: first, the Examiner’s requirements are simply an express request for clarification of how Applicant(s) intend their claims to be interpreted. Second, the requirements are reasonable in view of the USPTO’s goals of compact prosecution, productivity with

Art Unit: 3627

cautioned that even though claim interpretation begins with this presumption, after issuance the prosecution history may further limit claim scope if Applicant(s) disclaim or disavow a particular interpretation of the claims during prosecution. *Abbott Laboratories v. TorPharm Inc.*, 300 F.3d 1367, 1372, 63 USPQ2d 1929, 1931 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the preceding claim interpretation principles apply to all examined claims currently pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1-6, 8-2115, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Vrzalik, et al. (WO 99/13766).



Art Unit: 3627

Vrzalik teaches a medical information management system that comprises a medical management system, a patient appliance having an input/output device, means for selectively establishing a first communication line between the information management center and a patient appliance assigned to a patient, means for selectively establishing a second communication link between the information management center and a healthcare professional terminal of a healthcare professional supervising a patient whose medical information is being managed by the information management center, and means for selectively establishing a third communication link between the information management center and a third party terminal of a third party authorized by a patient whose medical information is being managed by the information management center to allow such a third-party access to at least a portion of the medical information associated with such a patient for reviewing same. See entire patent but see particularly Abstract; Figs. 1, 3, and 4; pg. 3, lines 4-34, pg. 4, lines 1-34, pg. 5, lines 26-34, pg. 6, lines 1-34, pg. 7, lines 1-34, pg. 8, lines 1-21, pg. 13, lines 7-34, pg. 15, lines 6-34, pg. 16, lines 1-34, pg. 17, lines 20-34, pg. 18, lines 1-34.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vrzalik, et al. (WO 99/13766) in view of Coli, et al. (6, 018,713).

Art Unit: 3627

Vrzalik teaches as set forth above. However, Vrzalik does not teach that advertisements are used in a second field with any of the patient, health professional party or third party information. Coli teaches that advertisements are utilized in a second field with health professionals, i.e. advertising for particular drug treatments or medical devices needed by patients may be provided as part of the test results reporting output (targeted advertising with hyperlinks) that includes full advisory information about the drug so that the physician can readily obtain information about possible treatments for conditions suggested by the test results. (col. 4, lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the step of including advertising as taught by Coli in Vrzalik because the skilled artisan would have recognized that this business practice permits the provider of the service generate a revenue stream by charging the advertisers and thus to recoup some of the costs of providing the service and thus keep the costs to the consumers and users down and increase his own profits.

Assuming arguendo that Vrzalik does not teach voice synthesizing as set forth in claims 8 and 17, claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vrzalik, et al. (WO 99/13766) in view of Abdoh (6, 564,207).

Vrzalik teaches as set forth above. Assuming arguendo that Vrzalik does not teach voice synthesizing, Abdoh teaches that voice synthesizing can be used to feed medical information for monitoring patients into a database by patients/health providers via a communications link. Abdoh further teaches that this method provides a versatile and flexible method of generating and storing multiple questionnaires and of collecting and analyzing responses to the questionnaires, eliminates the need for printing paper questionnaires, out-mailing and reply

Art Unit: 3627

postage costs, data entry errors and costs, statistical analysis costs, time lapse problems between mailing and getting the results analyzed, and it is flexible enough to be easily customized to meet each and every need in patient satisfaction, functional health status assessment, patient centered outcomes evaluation, etc. (cols. 3-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the step of voice synthesizing as set forth in Abdoh in Vrзалik for the explicit reasons set forth in Abdoh.

### *Conclusion*

In accordance with the USPTO's goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and reduction of cycle time, and because "the continual, chief complaint of inventors and their lawyers: that patent examiners are abysmal communicators, both orally and in writing,"<sup>8</sup> the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has provided Applicant(s) with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. If Applicant(s) disagree with *any* factual determination or legal conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied,<sup>9</sup> the Examiner respectfully requests Applicant(s) *in their next response* to expressly traverse the Examiner's position and provide appropriate arguments in support thereof. Failure by Applicant(s) *in their next response* to traverse the Examiner's positions and provide appropriate arguments in support thereof will be considered an admission by Applicant(s) of

---

<sup>8</sup> Sabra Chartrand, *A Bid to Overcome Patent Backlogs*, 152 N.Y. Times C2 (Sept. 23, 2002).

<sup>9</sup> E.g., if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner's implied position that the references are analogous art.

Art Unit: 3627

the factual determinations and legal conclusion not expressly traversed.<sup>10</sup> By addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicant(s) agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and Applicant(s) to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time.



Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer I. Harle whose telephone number is (703) 306-2906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P. Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Jennifer Ione Harle  
June 16, 2003

  
Richard Chilcot  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center  


---

<sup>10</sup> See also MPEP §714.02, 37 CFR §1.111(b), and 37 CFR §1.104(c)(3).